

the angle ( $\beta$ ), at which the two wire belts (2, 3) run upward in relation to an imaginary second horizontal plane (H2) after the first deflection device (10), assumes a value between  $10^\circ$  and  $90^\circ$ , preferably between  $25^\circ$  and  $40^\circ$ .

A<sup>2</sup> d (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that isobaric dewatering elements (18, 19), as they are known, are arranged between the first deflection device (10) and the separating device (11), between which the forming fibrous web (4) runs, enclosed between the two wire belts (2, 3).

9. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 7, characterized in that the isobaric dewatering elements (18, 19) are designed as plates or as plate segments.

A<sup>3</sup> 10. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that after the separating device (11), there is arranged at least one flat suction element (20), which acts on the wire belt (2) which carries the forming fibrous web (4).

11. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that at the second deflection device (15), deflection of the wire belt (2) is carried out in such a way that the wire belt (2) subsequently runs downward at an angle ( $\gamma$ ) less than

60°, preferably less than 40°, in particular less than 25°, relative to an imaginary second vertical plane (V2).

- A3
12. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that at the second deflection device (15), deflection of the wire belt (2) is carried out in such a way that the wire belt (2) subsequently runs substantially horizontally.

15. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that a further sheet forming device (22), preferably a hybrid former, is arranged after the second deflection device (15).

16. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the second deflection device (15) is a suction roll (13), a shoe (21) with foils or a shoe with foils and with applied vacuum.

- A4
17. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that the distance (A) between the lower vertex (10.SU) of the first deflection device (10) and the upper vertex (15.SO) of the second deflection device (15) assumes a value between 1 and 8 m, preferably between 3 and 6 m.

18. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1,  
characterized in that  
the first deflection device (10) is a closed roll (16), an open roll or an open roll with  
applied vacuum.
19. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1,  
characterized in that  
the separating device (11) is designed as a suction separator (17) and/or as a vacuum  
shoe.
20. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1,  
characterized in that  
the forming roll (7) has a diameter (D7) of greater than 1200 mm, preferably greater  
than 1635 mm, in particular greater than 1760 mm.
21. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1,  
characterized in that  
the forming roll (7) has a dewatering capacity which has a value of at least 50%,  
preferably of at least 65%, of the total dewatering capacity of the twin-wire former  
(1).
22. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1,  
characterized in that

A4

the forming roll (7) is designed as an open roll.

25. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1,

characterized in that

the roll diameter (D16) of the deflection roll (16) is greater than the roll diameter (D7) of the forming roll (7) and/or the roll diameter (D13) of the suction roll (13).

26. (Amended) The twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1,

characterized in that

it has an overall height (H) in a range from 2 to 8 m, preferably from 3 to 6 m.

27. (Amended) Use of the twin-wire former (1) as claimed in claim 1, in particular in a former rebuild.



#### REMARKS

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter the foregoing amendment prior to examination of the above-identified patent application.

Further, Applicants submit that the instant amendment has been presented to avoid multiply dependent claims, and that the claims have not been narrowed and that this amendment has not been made for any reasons related to a statutory basis for patentability.

Should there be any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the below listed number.

Respectfully submitted,  
Alfred BUBIK et al.

  
Neil F. Greenblum  
Reg. No. 28,394 

January 2, 2002  
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.  
1941 Roland Clarke Place  
Reston, VA 20191  
(703) 716-1191

20220102 15:00:00